arXiv:1510.00495v2 [math.DS] 4 Apr 2016

ZERO-ONE LAW OF HAUSDORFF DIMENSIONS OF THE RECURRENT SETS

DONG HAN KIM AND BING LI*

ABSTRACT. Let (Σ, σ) be the one-sided shift space with m symbols and $R_n(x)$ be the first return time of $x \in \Sigma$ to the n-th cylinder containing x. Denote

$$E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta} = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \alpha,\ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \beta \right\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonically increasing function and $0 \le \alpha \le \beta \le +\infty$. We show that the Hausdorff dimension of the set $E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$ admits a dichotomy: it is either zero or one depending on φ, α and β.

Key Words: First return time, Hausdorff dimension.

AMS Subject Classification (2010): 28A80

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $m \ge 2$ be an integer and (Σ, σ) be one-sided shift space with m symbols, more precisely, $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \cdots, m-1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma(x) = (x_{i+1})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ for $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma$. A usual metric d on Σ is given as

$$d(x, y) = m^{-\inf\{k \ge 0 : x_{k+1} \ne y_{k+1}\}}$$

for $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, y = (y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma$. For $n \ge 1$ and $x \in \Sigma$, define the first return time of x to the initial word of length n as

$$R_n(x) = \inf\{j \ge 1 : x_{j+1}x_{j+2}\cdots x_{j+n} = x_1x_2\cdots x_n\},$$
$$R'_n(x) = \inf\{j \ge n : x_{j+1}x_{j+2}\cdots x_{j+n} = x_1x_2\cdots x_n\}.$$

* Corresponding author.

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) (2012R1A1A2004473), and by NSFC (no. 11201155 and 11371148).

That is,

$$R_n(x) = \inf\{j \geq 1 : \sigma^j(x)|_n = x|_n\} = \inf\{j \geq 1 : d(\sigma^j(x), x) \leq m^{-n}\},$$

where $x|_n$ is the prefix of x with the length n. Both R_n and R'_n are the same except for the case of very short return time. However, R'_n is slightly easier to investigate.

Let ν be any σ-invariant ergodic Borel probability measure on Σ. Ornstein and Weiss [16] proved that for ν-almost all $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R'_n(x)}{n} = h_\nu(\sigma),$$

where $h_\nu(\sigma)$ denotes the measure-theoretic entropy of ν with respect to σ (see also [9]).

The topic of the first return time of a point in a dynamical system is originated in the famous Poincaré recurrence theorem, (see [7, p. 61]) which states that μ-almost all $x \in X$ is recurrent in the sense

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} d(T^n x, x) = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T, d)$ is a metric measure-preserving dynamical system, by which we mean that (X, d) is a metric space and has a countable base, $\mathcal{B}$ is a sigma-field containing the Borel sigma-field of X and $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ is a measure-preserving dynamical system. Boshernitzan [3] improved (1.1) by a quantitative version

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{1/\alpha} d(T^n x, x) < \infty$$

for μ-almost every (a.e.) $x \in X$, where α is the dimension of the space in some sense. Let

$$\tau_r(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : d(T^n x, x) < r\}$$

and define the lower and upper recurrence rates of $x \in X$ as

$$\underline{R}(x) = \liminf_{r\to 0} R_r(x), \quad \overline{R}(x) = \limsup_{r\to 0} R_r(x),$$

where $R_r(x) = \frac{\log \tau_r(x)}{-\log r}$. Barreira and Saussol [2] proved that

$$\underline{R}(x) = \underline{d}_\mu(x), \quad \overline{R}(x) = \overline{d}_\mu(x), \quad \mu - \text{a.e.} \tag{1.2}$$

with the condition that μ has a so-called long return time (see [2]) and $\underline{d}_\mu(x) > 0$ for μ-a.e. x, where $\underline{d}_\mu(x)$, $\overline{d}_\mu(x)$ are the lower and upper pointwise dimensions of μ at $x \in X$ respectively. As a consequence of (1.2), if $\alpha > \underline{d}_\mu(x)$, then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{1/\alpha} d(T^n x, x) = 0,$$

which is a reformulation of Boshernitzan's result. Some other sufficient conditions of (1.2) were given in the literatures (for instance, [19, 20, 21]). The distribution of the first hitting time of the dynamical system is also considered (see [8, 10]).

It is shown by Tan and Wang [23, Theorem 1.3] (see also [11]) that for a positive function ψ defined on $\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \{x \in \Sigma : d(\sigma^n(x), x) < \psi(n) \ \text{ infinitely often}\} = \frac{1}{1+b}, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$b = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\log_m \min\{\psi(n), 1\}}{n}.$$

In 2001, Feng and Wu [6] studied the exceptional sets

$$\left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n'(x)}{n} = \alpha, \ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n'(x)}{n} = \beta \right\}$$

with $0 \le \alpha \le \beta \le \infty$ and proved that those sets are always of Hausdorff dimension one no matter what α and β are (see also [4, 18, 22]). Lau and Shu [12] extended this result to the dynamical systems with specification property by considering the topological entropy instead of Hausdorff dimension. Olsen [14] studied the set of the points for which the set of accumulation points of $\frac{\log R_n'(x)}{n}$ is a given interval for the self-conformal system satisfying a certain separation condition (see also [15]). He proved such set is of full Hausdorff dimension which can be applied to the case of the N-adic transformation with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Ban and Li [1] generalised this result to β-transformation for any $\beta > 1$ including the cases of full shifts, subshift of finite type, specification, synchronizing etc.

In [6] and [16], the authors considered the recurrence time $R'_n(x)$ with the exponential rate. What will happen if we replace the exponential rate with the polynomial rate? Denote

$$E'_{\alpha,\beta} = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R'_n(x)}{\log n} = \alpha,\ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R'_n(x)}{\log n} = \beta \right\}.$$

Peng [17] proved that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} E'_{\alpha,\beta} = 1$ for any $1 \le \alpha \le \beta \le +\infty$, where $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}$ means the Hausdorff dimension of some set.

However, for the short return time case it is worth to distinguish R_n and R'_n. Let $0 \le \alpha \le \beta \le \infty$ and denote

$$E_{\alpha,\beta} = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} = \alpha,\ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} = \beta \right\}.$$

Once the condition $\alpha \ge 1$ fails for R_n, we have $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} E_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ (see Corollary 1.2), which is the complement of the result in [17]. This result indicates that the Hausdorff dimensions of the recurrence sets with the polynomial rates may drop from the full dimension which is different with that in [6]. Furthermore, such dimensions are either zero or one.

Now we consider the case of general rate. More precisely, let $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a monotonically increasing function. Denote

$$E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta} = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \alpha,\ \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \beta \right\}.$$

We completely calculate the Hausdorff dimensions of the sets $E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$ by the following theorem, which is a generalization and complement of [6] and [17].

Write

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n} = \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n} = \gamma.$$

Theorem 1.1. *For any $0 \le \alpha \le \beta \le \infty$, we have*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \ \alpha \ge \dfrac{1}{\gamma} \text{ and } \beta \ge \dfrac{1}{\delta}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

with the convention $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$ and $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$.

Application of Theorem 1.1 to $\varphi(n) = \log n$ implies the following.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $0 \le \alpha \le \beta \le \infty$. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} E_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha \ge 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha < 1. \end{cases}$$

From the results in [6, 17] and Theorem 1.2, when $\varphi(n) = n$ or $\varphi(n) = \log n$, the values of $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta})$ just depend on α ($\beta \ge \alpha$ is a natural condition since otherwise, the set $(E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta})$ will be empty). The new phenomenon arises for general φ from Theorem 1.1, that is, the values of $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta})$ may depend on β as well.

2. Proof of the main result

Firstly we prove the zero-dimensional part of Theorem 1.1 by the following proposition, which is a consequence of (1.3).

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\alpha < 1$. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} \left\{ x \in \Sigma : \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} \le \alpha \right\} = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. For any $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \alpha$, the condition

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} \le \alpha$$

implies there exist infinitely many n's such that $R_n(x) < n^{\alpha+\varepsilon}$, that is, $n > R_n(x)^{1/(\alpha+\varepsilon)}$. By the definition of $R_n(x)$, we obtain $d(\sigma^{R_n(x)}(x), x) < m^{-n} < m^{-R_n(x)^{1/(\alpha+\varepsilon)}}$. Therefore the desired sets in (2.1) are the subsets of the set $\left\{ x \in \Sigma : d(\sigma^n(x), x) < m^{-n^{1/(\alpha+\varepsilon)}} \text{ infinitely often} \right\}$. We complete the proof by the application of (1.3). □

Proof of the zero-dimensional part of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $\alpha\gamma < 1$ with $\alpha < \infty$ and $\gamma < \infty$ or $\beta\delta < 1$ with $\beta < \infty$ and $\delta < \infty$. Since

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} \le \left(\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \right) \cdot \left(\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n} \right) = \alpha\gamma,$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} \le \left(\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \right) \cdot \left(\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n} \right) = \beta\delta,$$

we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\log n} < 1.$$

By Proposition 2.1, such point set is zero dimensional, which implies that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}) = 0. \qquad \square$$

Now we concentrate on the proof of the one-dimensional part of Theorem 1.1. The idea is to construct a subset of $E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$ with full Hausdorff dimension for different cases of φ, α, β. The following technical lemma provides such subsets with dimension one, which is a generalization of Lemma 1 in [6] and the ideas of proofs are same.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{n_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ and $\{\ell_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ be two strictly increasing sequences of natural numbers satisfying the following conditions:*
(i) $\ell_{i+1} \geq \ell_i + n_i + 3$;
(ii) $\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{\ell_i} = 0$.
Then the set

$$A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\}) := \{x \in \Sigma : R_n(x) = \ell_{i+1} \text{ for all large } n \text{ with } n_i < n \leq n_{i+1}\}$$

is of full Hausdorff dimension.

Proof. Let $p > 2$ be a natural number. Define

$$F_p = \{x \in \Sigma : x_j = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq p, x_{pk+1} = x_{pk+p} = 1 \text{ for } k \geq 1\}.$$

By the dimensional formula of the self-similar set (see [5, p.130], see also [6]), we know that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} F_p = \frac{p-2}{p}.$$

We will construct a map $g : F_p \to A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})$ in the following and show that g^{-1} is nearly Lipschitz on $g(F_p)$, that is, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that $d(g(x), g(y)) < 2^{-k}$ implies $d(x, y) < 2^{-(1-\varepsilon)k}$ for all $k \geq M$.

Let $x \in F_p$ and $x^{(0)} = x$. Find the minimal k_0 such that $\ell_{k_0} - 1 > p$ and let $x^{(1)} = x^{(2)} = \cdots = x^{(k_0-1)} = x^{(0)}$. Assume that the sequence

$x^{(k-1)} = (x_i^{(k-1)})$ has been defined $(k \geq k_0)$ and now we define $x^{(k)}$. Put the word $w_k(x) = 1(x^{(k-1)}|_{n_k})\overline{x_{n_k+1}^{(k-1)}}1$, where $x^{(k-1)}|_{n_k}$ means the prefix word of $x^{(k-1)}$ with length n_k and $\overline{x_{n_k+1}^{(k-1)}} = x_{n_k+1}^{(k-1)} + 1 \pmod m$. Then $x^{(k)}$ is given by inserting $w_k(x)$ in $x^{(k-1)}$ at the place ℓ_k, i.e.,

$$x^{(k)} = x_1^{(k-1)} x_2^{(k-1)} \cdots x_{\ell_k-1}^{(k-1)} w_k(x) x_{\ell_k}^{(k-1)} x_{\ell_k+1}^{(k-1)} \cdots .$$

Since $\{\ell_k\}$ is increasing to infinity and $x^{(k)}|_{\ell_k-1} = x^{(k-1)}|_{\ell_k-1}$, the limit of $\{x^{(k)}\}$ exists, denoted by x^*. Indeed, x^* is obtained by inserting the sequence of words $\{w_k(x)\}$ in $x = x_1^{(0)} x_2^{(0)} \cdots x_n^{(0)} \cdots$.

Now we prove $x^* \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$. In fact, let $n_i < n \leq n_{i+1}$ for some $i \geq 1$ with $n_i > p$. Since $x^*|_{\ell_{i+1}+n_{i+1}+3} = x^{(i+1)}|_{\ell_{i+1}+n_{i+1}+3}$ (by condition (i)), by the construction of $x^{(i+1)}$, we know that $R_n(x^*) = R_n(x^{(i+1)}) \leq \ell_{i+1}$. It remains to show that $R_n(x^{(i+1)}) < \ell_{i+1}$ can not happen, that is, $x^{(i+1)}|_n$ cannot reappear in $x^{(i+1)}|_{\ell_{i+1}+n-1} = (x^{(i)}|_{\ell_{i+1}-1})1(x^{(i)}|_{n-1})$. In fact, since $x^{(i+1)}|_n$ begins with p consecutive zeros which does not appear in x except at the beginning by the structure of $x \in F_p$, the only possible places where $x^{(i+1)}|_n$ may appear are $w_j(x)$ for some $1 \leq j \leq i$. However, $x^{(i+1)}|_n$ cannot appear in $w_j(x)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i$ because the maximal length of common prefixes between $x^{(i+1)}|_n$ and $w_j(x)$ is n_j due to the existence of $\overline{x_{n_j+1}^{(j-1)}}$ in $w_j(x)$ and $n > n_j$. Therefore, $R_n(x^*) = \ell_{i+1}$, that is, $x^* \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$. So we have the map $g : F_p \to A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$ defined as $g(x) = x^*$.

In the following, we show that g^{-1} is nearly Lipschitz on $g(F_p)$. Indeed, suppose $d(x^*, y^*) < m^{-k}$ for some $x, y \in F_p$ and $\ell_i \leq k < \ell_{i+1}$, then $x_1^* x_2^* \cdots x_k^* = y_1^* y_2^* \cdots y_k^*$. Since $x = g^{-1}(x^*)$ is obtained by removing the parts of $w_j(x)$ from x^* and similar for y, it turns out that $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{k'} = y_1 y_2 \cdots y_{k'}$, where

$$k = k - \sum_{j=1}^{i} (n_j + 3).$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^{i}(n_j+3) \le i(n_i+3)$, by condition (ii) and $\ell_i \le k$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that for all $k > M$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i}(n_j+3) \le i(n_i+3) < \ell_i\varepsilon < \varepsilon k.$$

So $d(x,y) \le m^{-k'} < m^{-(1-\varepsilon)k}$. Thus

$$d(g^{-1}(x^*), g^{-1}(y^*)) \le d(x^*,y^*)^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} g(F_p) \ge (1-\varepsilon)\dim_{\mathrm{H}} F_p$ (see [5, Proposition 2.3]). So $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} g(F_p) \ge \dim_{\mathrm{H}} F_p$ by letting $\varepsilon \to 0$. Notice that $A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\}) \supset g(F_p)$ and $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} F_p = \frac{p-2}{p}$, we have

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\}) \ge \frac{p-2}{p}.$$

We conclude the assertion of the lemma by letting $p \to \infty$. □

The proof of the one-dimensional part relies on the applications of Lemma 2.2 by constructing proper sequences $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$, and verifying the corresponding $A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})$ is a subset of $E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$. For any $x \in A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})$, since $R_n(x) = \ell_i$ for all $n_{i-1}+1 \le n \le n_i$, we know that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)},$$
$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}.$$

So the subsequences $\{n_i\}$ and $\{n_i+1\}$ are essential for the lower and upper recurrence rates. The following two technical lemmas are needed for the construction of the sequences $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$.

Lemma 2.3. *For a positive function $\varphi(n)$ and a constant $C \ge 1$ we can choose a sequence of positive integers $\{n_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying that*

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i} = \gamma, \qquad \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n_i+1)}{\log(n_i+1)} = \delta$$

and

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i} = C, \qquad \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{i} = \infty.$$

Proof. First, suppose that $C > 1$. Choose $n_1 > e$. For each n_k choose an integer m_k such that

$$\log(\log m_k) - \log(\log n_k) \geq k \log C$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(m_k)}{\log m_k} - \gamma \right| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for } 0 \leq \gamma < \infty, \qquad \frac{\varphi(m_k)}{\log m_k} > k \text{ for } \gamma = \infty.$$

Denote

$$d_k = \left\lfloor \frac{\log(\log m_k) - \log(\log n_k)}{\log C} \right\rfloor \geq k \tag{2.2}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. For $0 \leq j \leq d_k$ define r_{k+j} by letting

$$\log(\log r_{k+j}) = \log(\log n_k) + \frac{j}{d_k} \cdot (\log(\log m_k) - \log(\log n_k)). \tag{2.3}$$

Then for $1 \leq j \leq d_k$

$$\log \left(\frac{\log r_{k+j}}{\log r_{k+j-1}} \right) = \frac{\log(\log m_k) - \log(\log n_k)}{d_k}.$$

Since

$$\log C \leq \frac{\log(\log m_k) - \log(\log n_k)}{d_k} < \frac{(d_k + 1) \log C}{d_k} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) \log C,$$

we have for $1 \leq j \leq d_k$

$$C \leq \frac{\log r_{k+j}}{\log r_{k+j-1}} < C^{1+1/k}. \tag{2.4}$$

Let $n_{k+j} = \lceil r_{k+j} \rceil$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_k$, where $\lceil t \rceil$ is the ceiling function. Note that $n_{k+d_k} = m_k$.

Next, we choose m'_k such that

$$\log(\log m'_k) - \log(\log n_{k+d_k}) \geq (k + d_k) \log C$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(m'_k + 1)}{\log(m'_k + 1)} - \delta \right| < \frac{1}{k + d_k}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \delta < \infty,$$
$$\frac{\varphi(m'_k + 1)}{\log(m'_k + 1)} > k + d_k, \quad \text{for } \delta = \infty.$$

Then, denote d'_k the same way as in (2.2) (replacing m_k, n_k by m'_k, n_{k+d_k} respectively) and define r_{k+d_k+j} as (2.3) for $1 \leq j \leq d'$ and

$n_{k+d_k+j} = \lceil r_{k+d_k+j} \rceil$ for $1 \le j \le d'_k$. Note that $n_{k+d_k+d'_k} = m'_k$. We defined $n_{k+1}, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_{k+d_k+d'_k}$ from n_k. Starting from $n_{k+d_k+d'_k}$ we repeat this procedure again. Inductively, we obtain a sequence $\{n_k\}$by this procedure satisfying

$$\limsup_k \frac{\varphi(n_k)}{\log n_k} = \gamma, \qquad \liminf_k \frac{\varphi(n_k+1)}{\log(n_k+1)} = \delta.$$

On the other hand, we deduce from (2.4) by letting k to infinity that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log r_{i+1}}{\log r_i} = C.$$

Since $r_i \le n_i < r_i + 1$ and r_i goes to infinity, we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i} = C.$$

Also by (2.4) we have

$$\log n_i \ge \log r_i \ge C^{i-1} \log r_1 = C^{i-1} \log n_1.$$

It follows by the assumption of $C > 1$ that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{i} = \infty.$$

Now assume that $C = 1$. Let $n_1 = 3$. Then $1^2 \le \log n_1 < 2^2$. For each integer n_k with $k^2 \le \log n_k < (k+1)^2$, choose an integer m_k such that

$$\log m_k \ge (k+1)^2$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(m_k)}{\log m_k} - \gamma \right| < \frac{1}{k} \text{ for } 0 \le \gamma < \infty, \qquad \frac{\varphi(m_k)}{\log m_k} > k, \text{ for } \gamma = \infty.$$

Denote

$$d_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\log m_k} - k \right\rfloor. \tag{2.5}$$

For each $1 \le j < d_k$ put

$$n_{k+j} = \left\lceil \exp((k+j)^2) \right\rceil \text{ and } n_{k+d_k} = m_k.$$

Then for all $1 \le j \le d_k$

$$(k+j)^2 \le \log n_{k+j} < (k+j+1)^2. \tag{2.6}$$

Next, we choose m'_k such that

$$\log m'_k \geq (k + d_k + 1)^2$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(m'_k + 1)}{\log(m'_k + 1)} - \delta \right| < \frac{1}{k + d_k}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \delta < \infty,$$
$$\frac{\varphi(m'_k + 1)}{\log(m'_k + 1)} > k + d_k, \quad \text{for } \delta = \infty.$$

Then, denote $d'_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\log m'} - (k + d_k) \right\rfloor$ as before and define $n_{k+d_k+j} = \lceil \exp((k + d_k + j)^2) \rceil$ $(1 \leq j < d'_k)$ and $n_{k+d_k+d'_k} = m'_k$. Repeating this procedure, we obtain a sequence $\{n_k\}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_k \frac{\varphi(n_k)}{\log n_k} = \gamma, \qquad \liminf_k \frac{\varphi(n_k + 1)}{\log(n_k + 1)} = \delta$$

and

$$k^2 \leq \log n_k < (k + 1)^2,$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i} = 1, \qquad \lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\log n_i}{i} = \infty. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be a positive monotone increasing function which tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$.*

(i) We can choose a sequence of positive integers $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying that for each $i \geq 1$

$$\varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i + 1) \leq 3, \qquad \varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i) > 1.$$

(ii) We can choose a sequence of positive integers $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying that

$$\frac{\varphi(m_{i+1})}{\varphi(m_i + 1)} \to 1 \text{ and } \frac{\log m_{i+1}}{\log m_i} \to 1$$

and for each i, either $m_{i+1} \geq m_i \log m_i$ or $\varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i) > 1$.

Proof. (i) Choose $n_1 \geq 3$. For each n_i we choose n_{i+1} as

$$n_{i+1} = \min\{n : \varphi(n) > \varphi(n_i) + 1\}.$$

and define a sequence $\{m_i\}$ as

$$m_i = \begin{cases} n_i, & \text{if } \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) \le 2, \\ n_{i+1} - 1, & \text{if } \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) > 2. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$n_i \le m_i \le n_{i+1} - 1 \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\varphi(n_{i+1} - 1) - \varphi(n_i) \le 1. \tag{2.8}$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) \le 2$, then we have from (2.7) and (2.8)

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i + 1) &\le \varphi(n_{i+2} - 1) - \varphi(n_i) \\ &= \varphi(n_{i+2} - 1) - \varphi(n_{i+1}) + \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) \\ &\le 1 + 2 = 3 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i) \ge \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) > 1.$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) > 2$, we have $m_i = n_{i+1} - 1$ so that by (2.8)

$$\varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i + 1) \le \varphi(n_{i+2} - 1) - \varphi(n_{i+1}) \le 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(m_{i+1}) - \varphi(m_i) &\ge \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_{i+1} - 1) \\ &= \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) + \varphi(n_i) - \varphi(n_{i+1} - 1) > 1. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Choose $n_1 \ge 3$. For each n_i we choose n_{i+1} as

$$n_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \min\{n : \varphi(n) > \varphi(n_i) + 1\}, & \text{if } \varphi(\lceil n_i \log n_i \rceil) > \varphi(n_i) + 1, \\ \lceil n_i \log n_i \rceil, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and define a sequence $\{m_i\}$ as

$$m_i = \begin{cases} n_i, & \text{if } \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) \le 2, \\ n_{i+1} - 1, & \text{if } \varphi(n_{i+1}) - \varphi(n_i) > 2. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$n_{i+1} < n_i \log n_i + 1, \qquad n_i \le m_i \le n_{i+1} - 1 \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\varphi(n_{i+1}-1)-\varphi(n_i)\le 1. \tag{2.10}$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)\le 2$, then we have from (2.9) and (2.10)

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(m_{i+1})-\varphi(m_i+1) &\le \varphi(n_{i+2}-1)-\varphi(n_i)\\ &= \varphi(n_{i+2}-1)-\varphi(n_{i+1})+\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)\\ &\le 1+2=3\end{aligned}$$

and if $\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)>2$, we have $m_i=n_{i+1}-1$ so that by (2.10)

$$\varphi(m_{i+1})-\varphi(m_i+1)\le \varphi(n_{i+2}-1)-\varphi(n_{i+1})\le 1.$$

Thus, we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_{i+1})}{\varphi(m_i+1)}=1.$$

It follows from (2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}m_{i+1}&\le n_{i+2}-1<n_{i+1}\log n_{i+1}<(n_i\log n_i+1)\log(n_i\log n_i+1)\\ &\le (m_i\log m_i+1)\log(m_i\log m_i+1),\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log m_{i+1}}{\log m_i}=1.$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)\le 2$ and $\varphi(\lceil n_i\log n_i\rceil)>\varphi(n_i)+1$, then

$$\varphi(m_{i+1})-\varphi(m_i)\ge\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)>1.$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)\le 2$ and $\varphi(\lceil n_i\log n_i\rceil)\le\varphi(n_i)+1$, then

$$m_{i+1}\ge n_{i+1}=\lceil n_i\log n_i\rceil=\lceil m_i\log m_i\rceil\ge m_i\log m_i.$$

If $\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)>2$, then, by (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(m_{i+1})-\varphi(m_i)&\ge\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_{i+1}-1)\\ &=\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i)+\varphi(n_i)-\varphi(n_{i+1}-1)>1.\end{aligned}$$ □

Now we are ready to show the left part of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of the one-dimensional part of Theorem 1.1. Recall

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}=\gamma,\quad \liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}=\delta.$$

(i) Suppose that $\alpha=\beta=\infty$.

Choose $n_i=i$ and $\ell_i=\max\{e^{i\varphi(i)},\ell_{i-1}+n_{i-1}+3,i^2(i+3)\}$, $\ell_0=1$. Then $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$ and satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2, thus for any $x\in A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})$, note that $R_n(x)=\ell_i$ for all $n_{i-1}+1\le n\le n_i$, we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)}\ge\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log\ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)}\ge\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{i\varphi(i)}{\varphi(i)}=\infty.$$

Therefore, $A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})\subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

(ii) Suppose that $\beta=\infty$, $0\le\alpha<\infty$ and $\gamma\in[1/\alpha,\infty]$ for $\alpha>0$, $\gamma=\infty$ for $\alpha=0$.

We can choose an increasing sequence of positive integers $\{n_i\}$ such that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i}=\gamma,$$

$$\varphi(n_i)>i\varphi(n_{i-1}+1),\ \log n_i>i\varphi(n_{i-1}+1),\ \log n_i>\log n_{i-1}+i^2+2$$

and if $\gamma=\infty$,

$$\frac{\varphi(n_{i+1})}{\log n_{i+1}}>\frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i}.$$

Let

$$\ell_i:=\begin{cases}\lceil e^{\alpha\varphi(n_i)}\rceil, & \text{if } 0<\alpha<\infty,\gamma=\infty,\\ \lceil(n_i)^{\alpha\gamma}\log n_i\rceil, & \text{if } 0<\alpha<\infty,\gamma<\infty\\ \lceil n_i\log n_i\rceil, & \text{if } \alpha=0,\gamma=\infty.\end{cases}$$

If $0 < \alpha < \infty, \gamma = \infty$, then for i large enough to make $\frac{\varphi(n_{i+1})}{\log n_{i+1}} > \frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i} > \frac{2}{\alpha}$ and $n_i \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i &\geq e^{\alpha\varphi(n_{i+1})} - e^{\alpha\varphi(n_i)} - 1 = e^{\alpha\varphi(n_i)} \left(e^{\alpha(\varphi(n_{i+1})-\varphi(n_i))} - 1\right) - 1 \\
&> e^{2\log n_i} \left(e^{\alpha\left(\frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i}\varphi(n_i)-\varphi(n_i)\right)} - 1 \right) - 1 \\
&= (n_i)^2 \left(e^{\frac{\alpha\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i}(\log n_{i+1}-\log n_i)} - 1 \right) - 1 \\
&> (n_i)^2 \left(e^{2(\log n_{i+1}-\log n_i)} - 1\right) - 1 \\
&= (n_{i+1})^2 - (n_i)^2 - 1 = (n_{i+1} - n_i)(n_{i+1} + n_i) - 1 \geq n_i + 3
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{\ell_i} &\leq \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{n_i^2} \\
&= \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{n_i+3}{n_i}\right) \cdot \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i}{n_i}\right) = 1 \cdot 0 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For other cases of $0 < \alpha < \infty, \gamma < \infty$ and $\alpha = 0, \gamma = \infty$, for large i with $n_i \geq 4$

$$\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i \geq n_i(\log n_{i+1} - \log n_i) - 1 > 2n_i - 1 \geq n_i + 3$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{\ell_i} &\leq \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{n_i \log n_i} \\
&= \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{n_i+3}{n_i}\right) \cdot \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i}{\log n_i}\right) = 1 \cdot 0 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2. Since

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } 0 < \alpha < \infty, \gamma = \infty, \\ \lim \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \lim \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = \alpha\gamma \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma} = \alpha, & \text{if } 0 < \alpha < \infty, \gamma < \infty, \\ \lim \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \lim \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = 1 \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma} = 0, & \text{if } \alpha = 0, \gamma = \infty, \end{cases}$$

for any $x \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$ we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = \alpha$$

and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)}=\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}$$
$$=\begin{cases}\lim\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)}\lim\frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}=\alpha\cdot\infty=\infty, & \text{if } 0<\alpha<\infty,\gamma=\infty,\\ \lim\frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i}\lim\frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}=\alpha\gamma\cdot\frac{1}{\gamma}=\alpha, & \text{if } 0<\alpha<\infty,\gamma<\infty,\\ \lim\frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i}\lim\frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}=1\cdot\frac{1}{\gamma}=0, & \text{if } \alpha=0,\gamma=\infty.\end{cases}$$

Thus $A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})\subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

In the rest of the proof we only consider the case of finite α,β. Define

$$A:=\begin{cases}\alpha\gamma, & \text{if } 0<\alpha,\gamma<\infty,\\ 1, & \text{if } \alpha=0,\gamma=\infty,\\ \infty, & \text{if } \alpha>0,\gamma=\infty,\end{cases}\qquad B:=\begin{cases}\beta\delta, & \text{if } 0<\beta,\delta<\infty,\\ 1, & \text{if } \beta=0,\delta=\infty,\\ \infty, & \text{if } \beta>0,\delta=\infty.\end{cases}$$

(iii) Suppose that $0\le\alpha\le\beta<\infty$ and $A=B=\infty$, i.e., $0<\alpha\le\beta<\infty$ and $\delta=\gamma=\infty$.

Let $\{m_i\}$ be the sequence given by Lemma 2.4 (i), thus $\varphi(m_{i+1})\le\varphi(m_i+1)+3$ and $\varphi(m_{i+1})>\varphi(m_i)+1$.

Let $\tilde{\ell}_1=e^{\beta\varphi(m_1)}$. For each k with $\tilde{\ell}_k=e^{\beta\varphi(m_k)}$, we will choose k' and define $\tilde{\ell}_{k+1},\tilde{\ell}_{k+2},\dots,\tilde{\ell}_{k'}$, where $\tilde{\ell}_{k'}=e^{\beta\varphi(m_{k'})}$. Then by repeating the procedure inductively we define $\{\tilde{\ell}_i\}$. Let $\tilde{\ell}_k=e^{\beta\varphi(m_k)}$, then there exists a minimal integer $d\ge1$ such that

$$\varphi(m_{k+d})\ge\left(\frac{2\beta}{\alpha}-1\right)\varphi(m_k).$$

Define for $1\le j<d$

$$\tilde{\ell}_{k+j}=e^{\frac{2\beta-\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_k)+\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_{k+j})}>e^{\alpha\varphi(m_{k+j})},$$

and

$$\tilde{\ell}_{k+d}=e^{\alpha\varphi(m_{k+d})},\qquad \tilde{\ell}_{k+d+1}=e^{\beta\varphi(m_{k+d+1})}.$$

Then continue this procedure for $k'=k+d+1$.

For $0 \le j < d-1$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\ell}_{k+j+1} - \tilde{\ell}_{k+j} &= \tilde{\ell}_{k+j}\left(e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}(\varphi(m_{k+j+1})-\varphi(m_{k+j}))} - 1\right)\\ &> \tilde{\ell}_{k+j}\frac{\alpha(\varphi(m_{k+j+1})-\varphi(m_{k+j}))}{2} > \frac{\alpha}{2}\tilde{\ell}_{k+j}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\ell}_{k+d} - \tilde{\ell}_{k+d-1} &= \tilde{\ell}_{k+d-1}\left(e^{\alpha\varphi(m_{k+d})-\frac{2\beta-\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_k)-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_{k+d-1})} - 1\right)\\ &> \tilde{\ell}_{k+d-1}\left(\alpha\varphi(m_{k+d}) - \frac{2\beta-\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_k) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_{k+d-1})\right)\\ &\ge \tilde{\ell}_{k+d-1}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_{k+d}) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi(m_{k+d-1})\right) > \frac{\alpha}{2}\tilde{\ell}_{k+d-1},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\ell}_{k+d+1} - \tilde{\ell}_{k+d} &= \tilde{\ell}_{k+d}\left(e^{\beta\varphi(m_{k+d+1})-\alpha\varphi(m_{k+d})} - 1\right)\\ &> \tilde{\ell}_{k+d}\left(\beta\varphi(m_{k+d+1}) - \alpha\varphi(m_{k+d})\right) > \beta\tilde{\ell}_{k+d} > \frac{\alpha}{2}\tilde{\ell}_{k+d}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta = \infty$, for large i_0 so as to $\varphi(m_i) > \frac{3}{\alpha}\log m_i$ for $i \ge i_0$ we have

$$\tilde{\ell}_{i+1} - \tilde{\ell}_i > \frac{\alpha}{2}\tilde{\ell}_i \ge \frac{\alpha}{2}e^{\alpha\varphi(m_i)} > \frac{\alpha}{2}(m_i)^3,$$

thus for $i \ge i_0$

$$\tilde{\ell}_i > \frac{\alpha}{2}(m_i)^3 \ge \frac{\alpha}{2}i^2 m_i.$$

Thence, $\{m_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i = \lceil\tilde{\ell}_i\rceil\}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2. Thus, for any $x \in A(\{m_i\},\{\ell_i\})$ we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \liminf_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)} = \alpha$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} &= \limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)} = \limsup_{i\to\infty}\left(\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)}\right)\\ &= \left(\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)}\right)\left(\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)}\right) = \beta\cdot 1 = \beta.\end{aligned}$$

That is, $A(\{m_i\},\{\ell_i\}) \subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

(iv) Suppose that $0 \le \alpha \le \beta < \infty$ and $1 \le A < B = \infty$.

Since $\delta = \infty$, we deduce that $\gamma = \infty$ and $A = 1$. We can choose a sequence $\{n_i\}$ satisfying that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)} = \beta > 0.$$

Note that combined with the assumption $\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i} = \infty$, we get $\frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i}$ tends to infinity as $i \to \infty$, which implies that $\frac{i}{\log n_i}$ converges to 0. Let

$$\ell_i = \lceil n_i \log n_i \rceil.$$

Then for large i such that $\log \frac{n_{i+1}}{n_i} \geq 2$ and $n_i \geq 4$

$$\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i \geq n_i(\log n_{i+1} - \log n_i) - 1 > 2n_i - 1 \geq n_i + 3$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{\ell_i} &\leq \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(n_i+3)}{n_i \log n_i} \\ &= \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{n_i+3}{n_i}\right) \cdot \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i}{\log n_i}\right) = 1 \cdot 0 = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2. Thus, for any $x \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$ we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i}\right)\left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_i)}\right) = 1 \cdot 0 = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} &= \limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)} = \limsup_{i\to\infty} \left(\frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}\right) \\ &= \left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i}\right)\left(\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)}\right) = 1 \cdot \beta = \beta.\end{aligned}$$

That is, $A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\}) \subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

(v) Suppose that $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ and $1 \leq A \leq B < \infty$. By Lemma 2.3 there exists a sequence $\{n_i\}$ satisfying that

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n_i)}{\log n_i} = \gamma, \quad \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n_i+1)}{\log(n_i+1)} = \delta, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_{i+1}}{\log n_i} = \frac{B}{A}.$$

Let

$$\ell_i = \lceil (n_i)^A \log n_i \rceil.$$

Then $\{n_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.2.

If $x \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$, then $R_n(x) = \ell_i$ for each $n_{i-1} < n \le n_i$. Thus for $x \in A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\})$ we have for $n_{i-1} + 1 \le n \le n_i$

$$\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)} \le \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \le \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)},$$

where the equalities holds for $n = n_i$ and $n = n_{i-1} + 1$ respectively. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} &= \limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)} \\
&= \limsup_{i\to\infty} \left(\frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \cdot \frac{\log n_i}{\log(n_{i-1}+1)} \cdot \frac{\log(n_{i-1}+1)}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)} \right) \\
&= \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \cdot \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{\log(n_{i-1}+1)} \cdot \overline{\lim_{i\to\infty}} \frac{\log(n_{i-1}+1)}{\varphi(n_{i-1}+1)} \\
&= A \cdot \frac{B}{A} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta} = \frac{B}{\delta} = \beta
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} &= \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = \liminf_{i\to\infty} \left(\frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \cdot \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_i)} \right) \\
&= \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log \ell_i}{\log n_i} \cdot \liminf_{i\to\infty} \frac{\log n_i}{\varphi(n_i)} = A \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma} = \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $x \in E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$. It follows that $A(\{n_i\}, \{\ell_i\}) \subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

(vi) Suppose that $0 \le \alpha \le \beta < \infty$ and $1 \le B < A \le \infty$, i.e., $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \infty$.

We may assume that for all n

$$\delta \le \frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n} \le \gamma.$$

Since $\beta\delta < \alpha\gamma$ and $\alpha \le \beta$, we get $\gamma > \delta$. Put

$$C := \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha\gamma - \beta\delta}{\gamma - \delta}, & \text{if } \gamma < \infty, \\ \alpha & \text{if } \gamma = \infty, \end{cases} \quad D := \begin{cases} \frac{(\beta-\alpha)\gamma\delta}{\gamma-\delta}, & \text{if } \gamma < \infty, \\ (\beta - \alpha)\delta & \text{if } \gamma = \infty. \end{cases}$$

and let

$$\rho(x) := Cx + D.$$

Note that, $C > 0$ and $D \ge 0$. Thus $1 \le \beta\delta \le \rho(x) \le \alpha\gamma$ for all $\delta \le x \le \gamma$.

Let $\{m_i\}$ be the sequence given by Lemma 2.4 (ii), thus we have

$$\rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_{i+1})}{\log m_{i+1}}\right)\log m_{i+1}-\rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\right)\log m_i \\ \geq C(\varphi(m_{i+1})-\varphi(m_i)):=\Delta_i. \quad (2.11)$$

Choose

$$\tilde{\ell}_i = {m_i}^{\rho(\varphi(m_i)/\log m_i)}\varphi(m_i)\log m_i \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_i=\lfloor\tilde{\ell}_i\rfloor.$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\ell}_{i+1}-\tilde{\ell}_i &\geq m_i^{\rho(\varphi(m_i)/\log m_i)}\left(e^{\Delta_i}\varphi(m_{i+1})\log m_{i+1}-\varphi(m_i)\log m_i\right)\\ &\geq m_i\varphi(m_i)\left(e^{\Delta_i}\log m_{i+1}-\log m_i\right)\\ &\geq m_i\varphi(m_i)\big((1+\Delta_i)\log m_{i+1}-\log m_i\big)\\ &= m_i\varphi(m_i)\left(\Delta_i\log m_{i+1}+(\log m_{i+1}-\log m_i)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the first and the second inequalities are respectively from (2.11) and $\rho(\varphi(m_i)/\log m_i)\geq 1$, and the third holds since $e^x\geq 1+x$. By Lemma 2.4 (ii),

$$\tilde{\ell}_{i+1}-\tilde{\ell}_i \geq m_i\varphi(m_i)\min\left(C\log m_{i+1},\ \log\log m_i\right).$$

Thus, for i large enough that $m_i\geq 4$, $\varphi(m_i)\geq 2$, $C\log m_{i+1}\geq 1$ and $\log\log m_i\geq 1$ we get

$$\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i>\tilde{\ell}_{i+1}-\tilde{\ell}_i-1\geq 2m_i-1\geq m_i+3.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.4 (ii) that

$$\varphi(m_{i+1})\log m_{i+1}-\varphi(m_i)\log m_i\geq\min\left(\varphi(m_i)\log\log m_i,\ \log m_i\right),$$

thus for large $i\geq i_0$ with $\log m_{i_0}>\varphi(m_1)\log\log m_{i_0}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(m_i)\log m_i &\geq \varphi(m_{i_0})\log m_{i_0}+\sum_{j=i_0}^{i-1}\min\left(\varphi(m_1)\log\log m_i,\ \log m_i\right)\\ &\geq \varphi(m_{i_0})\log m_{i_0}+\varphi(m_1)\sum_{j=i_0}^{i-1}\log\log m_j,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\tilde{\ell}_i}{im_i} &= \frac{m_i{}^{\rho(\varphi(m_i)/\log m_i)}\varphi(m_i)\log m_i}{im_i} \geq \frac{\varphi(m_i)\log m_i}{i} \\ &> \frac{\varphi(m_1)}{i}\sum_{j=i_0}^{i-1}\log\log m_j \geq \frac{\varphi(m_1)}{i}\sum_{j=i_0}^{i-1}\log\log j \\ &\geq \frac{\varphi(m_1)}{i}\int_{i_0}^{i-1}\log\log x\,\mathrm{d}x \to \infty\end{aligned}$$

as $i \to \infty$. Hence, $\{m_i\}$ and $\{\ell_i\}$ satisfy the condition of Lemma 2.2.

By the choice of ℓ_i we have

$$\rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\right)\frac{\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)} \leq \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)} \leq \rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\right)\frac{\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)} + \frac{\log(\varphi(m_i)\log m_i)}{\varphi(m_i)}$$

Using the fact that

$$\frac{\rho(x)}{x} = C + \frac{D}{x}$$

is monotone decreasing for $\delta \leq x \leq \gamma$, we deduce that

$$\alpha = \frac{\rho(\gamma)}{\gamma} \leq \rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\right)\frac{\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)} \leq \frac{\rho(\delta)}{\delta} = \beta.$$

It fowllows that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)} \leq \beta + \frac{\log\varphi(m_i) + \log\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)}$$

If $x \in A(\{m_i\},\{\ell_i\})$, then for large n satisfying $m_{i-1} < n \leq m_i$, $R_n(x) = \ell_i$, thus

$$\frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)} \leq \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)} = \frac{\log \ell_i}{\varphi(m_i)}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)},$$

which implies that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \left(\beta + \frac{\log\varphi(m_i) + \log\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)}\right)\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)}.$$

It follows from the fact that $\varphi(n) \geq (\delta/2)\log n$ for sufficiently large n and $\log x/x \to 0$ as $x \to \infty$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_i)} = 0, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log\log m_i}{\varphi(m_i)} = 0.$$

Therefore, using Lemma 2.4 (ii) we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)}\le\beta\cdot\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\varphi(m_{i-1}+1)}=\beta.$$

Since the sequence $\{m_i\}$ satisfies Lemma 2.4 (ii) and φ is increasing,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}&=\limsup_{i\to\infty}\left(\max_{m_{i-1}+1\le n\le m_i}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}\right)\le\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_{i-1}}\\&=\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\frac{\log m_i}{\log m_{i-1}}=\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\cdot\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{\log m_i}{\log m_{i-1}}\\&=\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}\le\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}=\gamma.$$

Similarly, we get

$$\liminf_{i\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_i)}{\log m_i}=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(n)}{\log n}=\delta.$$

Choose a subsequence $\{m_{i_k}\}$ of $\{m_i\}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\varphi(m_{i_k})}{\log m_{i_k}}=\gamma$. By the continuity of ρ, then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\log R_{m_{i_k}}(x)}{\varphi(m_{i_k})}=\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\log\ell_{i_k}}{\log m_{i_k}}\frac{\log m_{i_k}}{\varphi(m_{i_k})}=\frac{1}{\gamma}\lim_{k\to\infty}\rho\left(\frac{\varphi(m_{i_k})}{\log m_{i_k}}\right)=\alpha.$$

Hence, we get $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)}=\alpha$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log R_n(x)}{\varphi(n)}=\beta$ in a similar way. Thus $x\in E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$. We have established that $A(\{m_i\},\{\ell_i\})\subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

Therefore, we deduce that

$$A(\{n_i\},\{\ell_i\})\subset E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}$$

for all cases, which implies that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}}E^{\varphi}_{\alpha,\beta}=1.$$

by Lemma 2.2. □

References

[1] J.-C. Ban and B. Li, *The multifractal spectra for the recurrence rates of beta-transformations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 420 (2014), 1662–1679.

[2] L. Barreira and B. Saussol, *Hausdorff dimension of measures via Poincare recurrence*, Comm. Math. Phys. 219 (2001), 443–463.

[3] M. Boshernitzan, *Quantitative recurrence results*, Invent. Math. 113 (1993), 617–631.

[4] H.-B. Chen, Z.-X. Wen and M. Yu, *The multifractal spectra of certain planar recurrence sets in the continued fraction dynamical system*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 422 (2015), no. 2, 1264–1276.

[5] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal geometry: Mathematical foundations and applications*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990.

[6] D. J. Feng and J. Wu, *The Hausdorff dimension of recurrent sets in symbolic spaces*, Nonlinearity. 14 (2001), 81–85.

[7] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1981.

[8] S. Galatolo, *Dimension and hitting time in rapidly mixing systems*, Math. Res. Lett. 14 (2007), no. 5, 797–805.

[9] S. Galatolo, D. H. Kim and K. K. Park, *The recurrence time for ergodic systems with infinite invariant measures*, Nonlinearity 19 (2006), no. 11, 2567–2580.

[10] S. Galatolo and M. J. Pacifico, *Lorenz-like flows: exponential decay of correlations for the Poincar map, logarithm law, quantitative recurrence*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 30 (2010), no. 6, 1703–1737.

[11] R. Hill and S. Velani, *The ergodic theory of shrinking targets*, Invent. Math. 119 (1995) 175–198.

[12] K. S. Lau and L. Shu, *The spectrum of Poincare recurrence*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. 28 (2008), 1917–1943.

[13] P. Mattila, *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces, Fractals and rectifiability*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 44. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[14] L. Olsen, *First return times: multifractal spectra and divergence points*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 10 (2004), no. 3, 635–656.

[15] L. Olsen, *Applications of multifractal divergence points to sets of numbers defined by their N-adic expansion*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 136 (2004), no. 1, 139-165.

[16] D. Ornstein and B. Weiss, *Entropy and data compression schemes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 39 (1993), 78–83.

[17] L. Peng, *Dimension of sets of sequences defined in terms of recurrence of their prefixes*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 343 (2006), no. 2, 129–133.

[18] L. Peng, B. Tan and B.-W. Wang, *Quantitative Poincaré recurrence in continued fraction dynamical system*, Sci. China Math. 55 (2012), no. 1, 131–140.

[19] J. Rousseau, *Recurrence rates for observations of flows*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 32 (2012), no. 5, 1727–1751.

[20] J. Rousseau and B. Saussol, *Poincaré recurrence for observations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 362 (2010), no. 11, 5845–5859.

[21] B. Saussol, *Recurrence rate in rapidly mixing dynamical system*, Discrete. Contin. Dyn. Sys. ser.A 15 (2006), 259–267.

[22] B. Saussol and J. Wu, *Recurrence spectrum in smooth dynamical system*, Nonlinearity. 16 (2003), 1991–2001.

[23] B. Tan and B.-W. Wang, *Quantitative recurrence properties for beta-dynamical system*, Adv. Math. 228 (2011), no. 4, 2071–2097.

[1]Department of Mathematics Education, Dongguk University-Seoul, Seoul, 100-715 Korea

E-mail address: kim2010@dongguk.edu

[2]Department of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, 510641, P.R. China

E-mail address: scbingli@scut.edu.cn